



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Y

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,997	10/11/2001	Michael J. Greenside	100110073-1	3308

7590 03/31/2003

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

LEE, JINHEE J

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2831

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application	Applicant(s)
	09/976,997	GREENSIDE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jinhee J Lee	2831

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 9-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected group, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5, use of the term "VersaModular Eurocard" renders this claim indefinite, since the owner of this term could change its meaning at any time. Examiner suggests generic terminology instead.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bostrom et al. (US005856632).

Re claim 1, Bostrom et al. discloses an assembly comprising: a filler panel body (40, card cage shielding contactor for example); and a locating element (lead-in flap 82 for example including part of 42) coupled to said filler panel body, said locating element adapted to orient said filler panel body with respect to a chassis (20) such that interference generating movement of said filler panel body is reduced (see figures 1-2 and 8).

Re claim 2, Bostrom et al. discloses an assembly comprising: an attaching device (fastener 30) adapted to be coupled to said filler panel body, said attaching device for removably coupling said filler panel body to said chassis (see figure 1).

Re claim 3, Bostrom et al. discloses an assembly comprising: an electromagnetic interference shield portion (40 for example) coupled to said filler panel body, said shield portion adapted to prevent EMI leakage from said chassis (see figures 1-2 and 8).

Re claim 6, Bostrom et al. discloses an assembly comprising: said locating element with head portion (unnumbered portion, part of 42 for example); an insertion portion (82 for example) coupled to said head portion, said insertion portion adapted to be inserted into an opening in said chassis to reduce said interference generating movement of said filler panel body with respect to said chassis (see figures 1-2 and 8).

Re claim 7, Bostrom et al. discloses an assembly comprising: said locating element coupled to said filler panel body such that said head portion is flush with said filler panel body (see figures 1-2 and 8).

Re claim 8, Bostrom et al. discloses an assembly comprising: said locating element with a retention portion (unnumbered portion between 82 and part of 42 for example) coupled to said head portion and adapted to enhance coupling of said locating element and said filler panel body (see figures 1-2 and 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bostrom et al.

Re claim 4, Bostrom et al. substantially discloses an assembly as set forth in claim 1 with said locating element coupled to said filler panel body at a location such that said locating element will insert into a mounting hole disposed on said chassis.

Bostrom et al. does not explicitly disclose that the assembly is in accordance with a compact peripheral component interconnect standard. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the assembly that is in accordance with a compact peripheral component interconnect standard, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Re claim 5, Bostrom et al. substantially discloses an assembly as set forth in claim 1 with said locating element coupled to said filler panel body at a location such that said locating element will insert into a mounting hole disposed on said chassis. Bostrom et al. does not explicitly disclose that the assembly is in accordance with a VersaModular Eurocard standard. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the assembly that is in accordance with a VersaModular Eurocard standard, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinhee Lee whose telephone number is 703-306-0154. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, Th, F at 6:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on 703-308-3682. The fax phone numbers

Application/Control Number: 09/976,997
Art Unit: 2831

Page 6

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318
for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-
0956.

jil
March 24, 2003

Dean A. Reichard 3/24/03
DEAN A. REICHARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800